## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-13 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1-3, 9 and 11-12 are amended.

The courtesies extended to Applicant's representative by Examiner Zanelli at the telephone interview held January 5, 2005 are appreciated. The reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action are incorporated into the remarks below and constitute Applicants' record of the interview.

## I. Prior Art

Applicants acknowledge that claims 1-13 are distinguishable over the prior art and that claim 13 is allowed.

## II. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Specifically, the Office Action asserts that:

- A. Claim 1 is unclear whether "a value involved with rear wheel braking forces" is the same as "a first value involved with rear wheel braking force." Additionally, the Office Action asserts that the claim is unclear with regard to the limitation "higher,"
- B. Claim 2 is unclear with regard to "the values involved with rear wheel braking force,"
  - C. Claim 3 is unclear as to which "second value" is being referred to.
- D. Claim 9 is unclear regarding "the value" since multiple values have been previously recited in claim 1,
- E. Claim 11 lacks antecedence in the following phrase, "the braking action by the driver detected by the detector,"

Application No. 10/815,833

Claim 12 - the following phrases lack antecedence, "the master cylinder F.

pressure" and "the rear wheel sensor," and

The Office Action asserts that all claims depending from a rejected base claim G.

are also rejected as containing the same deficiencies.

Applicants have amended the claims based on the Examiner's recommendations made

in the Office Action. Therefore, the rejections have been obviated by this Amendment. It is

respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections of claims 1-

12.

III. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in

condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 1-13 are

earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place

this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the

undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,

James A. Oliff

Régistration No. 27,075

John W. Fitzpatrick

Registration No. 41,018

JAO:KDB/mdw

Date: January 10, 2006

-8-

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. Box 19928 Alexandria, Virginia 22320 Telephone: (703) 836-6400 DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION
Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;
Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461